

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-4 and 6-14 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 1 and 9 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

#### §102 Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 11 and 14

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dunn (U.S. Patent No. 5,945,987). Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to address the rejection.

In the Background section of the Specification, it was disclosed that “[i]n the case of digital satellite broadcasting, the number of channels is very large, and a single channel provides many programs. ... A viewer is thus required to have special skills in order to appropriately select a desired broadcast program from among such a huge number of broadcast programs, and it is often difficult for the viewer to retrieve a desired broadcast program.” *Background of the Specification, page 1, lines 15-22*. “In order to select the appropriate program, the EPG data is searched for the appropriate program using a keyword. In general, retrieval using a keyword, and particularly ambiguous retrieval, demands a large database and fast processing. In consideration of the expense, it is substantially impossible for an individual to perform such retrieval.” *Background of the Specification, page 2, lines 13-19*.

“Therefore, the viewer is connected to a broadcast program retriever via communication lines such as telephone lines. The viewer gives a keyword for retrieving a desired broadcast program to the broadcast program retriever. The broadcast program retriever searches for the

desired program and provides the viewer with information on the retrieval results. When the viewer receives the entirety of the information on the retrieval results via the telephone lines and the like, detailed information on the broadcast program is generally transmitted, thus requiring a long communication period, which is expensive.” *Background of the Specification, page 2, line 20 to page 3, line 6.*

To solve this problem, embodiments of the present invention provide broadcast program retrieval system and method for retrieving a desired broadcast program among a plurality of broadcast programs. For example, the structure of system claim 1, as presented herein, includes:

“a data server including a database configured to receive and store broadcast program information, and at least one function for searching the broadcast program information, which includes at least one program retrieval identification code and other information related to broadcast programs;  
and

a user server configured to receive and store the broadcast program information, said user server operating to send to the data server at least one content keyword for searching the broadcast program information for the desired broadcast program, said user server operating to receive from the data server only a select number of program retrieval identification codes related to said at least one content keyword as a result of the searching by the data server,

wherein the select number of program retrieval identification codes received from the data server enables said user server to retrieve a select number of broadcast program information stored in the user server, and allows the user server to select the desired broadcast program from among said plurality of broadcast programs using the retrieved select number of broadcast program information.”

(emphasis added)

In summary, the embodiments of the present invention provide for performing a time- and memory-intensive search through the broadcast program information (e.g., EPG data) using the data server when the keyword(s) is sent to the data server from the user server. The data server receives the keyword(s) from the user server and performs the search of the keyword(s) in

the database of the data server using the search function. The data server sends the result of the search as a list of program retrieval identification codes only, which is significantly smaller in size than a list of broadcast program information. The user server receives only the list of program retrieval identification codes and uses the list to retrieve the desired list of broadcast program information for only the relevant programs from the entire broadcast program information stored in the user server. Thus, the embodiments are configured to address the drawbacks of conventional broadcast program retrieval systems.

Although the interactive entertainment network system of Dunn searches the SQL broadcast program database using program IDs, the system sends all program information (not just the program IDs) to the user. Therefore, the Dunn's system is equivalent to the conventional system described in the Background section where "the viewer receives the entirety of the information on the retrieval results via the telephone lines and the like, [such that] detailed information on the broadcast program is generally transmitted, thus requiring a long communication period, which is expensive." Accordingly, the Dunn's system fails to address the problems associated with the convention program retrieval systems.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is maintained Dunn fails to teach or suggest all the limitations recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable over Dunn. Further, since independent claim 9 closely parallels, and includes substantially similar limitations as, claim 1, claim 9 should also be allowable over Dunn. Since claims 2-4, 6, and 8 depend from claim 1, and claims 11 and 14 depend from claim 9, claims 2-4, 6, 8, 11, and 14 should also be allowable over Dunn.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 11 and 14 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof

is respectfully requested.

§ 103 Rejection of Claims 7, 10, and 12-13

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 7, 10, and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn.

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 1 and 9, and since claims 7, 10, and 12-13 depend from claims 1 and 9, and claims 7, 10, and 12-13 should be allowable over Dunn.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 7, 10, and 12-13 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1-4 and 6-14 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.


In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:

  
Samuel S. Lee, Reg. No. 42,791 for  
William S. Frommer  
Reg. No. 25,506  
(212) 588-0800